

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 4, 5, 7, 9, 15, 16, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard are the invention. However, claims 4, 5, 7, 9, 15, 16, and 18 have been indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-18 have been indicated as being allowable.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 7, 9, 15, 16, and 18 in accordance with the Examiner suggestions, and amended claim 14 to correct a minor informality. Accordingly, claims 1-18 remain pending for consideration, with claims 19-29 and 33 being withdrawn and claims 30-32 having been canceled.

All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 4, 5, 7, 9, 15, 16, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard are the invention.

With regards to claims 7, 9, 15, 16, and 18, Applicants have amended these claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7, 9, 15, 16, and 18 comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 7, 9, 15, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

With regards to claims 4 and 5, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons. Claim 4 stands rejected for allegedly being indefinite “because ‘cesium pellet’ lacks antecedent basis.” Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 3, from which claim 4 depends, recites, in part, “wherein the plug is formed of a cesium pellet.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the recitation of “a cesium pellet” in claim 3, from which claim 4 depends, provides antecedent basis for recitation of “the cesium pellet” in claim 4. Similarly, claim 5, which is directly dependent from claim 4, finds antecedent basis in claims 1, 3, and 4. Thus, for at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 4 and 5 comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-18 are in clear condition for allowance.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 
David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

DATE: September 10, 2004

Customer Number: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
202-739-3000